

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 14-18 are new. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

Claim 6 was said to be indefinite for a lack of antecedent basis for the terms "top mold member" and "bottom mold member." These terms have been changed to "first mold member" and "second mold member," respectively, which have antecedent basis. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engelberger *et al.* in view of Kobayashi *et al.* and further in view of Kenichi or Worden *et al.* or Tadanori *et al.* or Lundquist. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

First, the published application of Worden *et al.* was filed after the priority date of this application. Therefore, the application of Worden *et al.* is not prior art, and the rejection should be withdrawn to the extent that it relies on Worden *et al.*

Also, The Japanese publication to Kenichi fails to disclose plural springs. The claims call for plural "springs," and Kenichi shows only one spring 13. Also, the core 12 being urged by the spring 13 is not analogous to the movable part of the present invention or the movable mandrel of Engelberger *et al.*, since the movable part of Kenichi seems to apply force downward on the core 1. Therefore, even if the Kenichi reference is combined with Engelberger *et al.* and

Kobayashi *et al.*, the terms of the claims are not satisfied. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn to the extent that it relies on the Japanese publication to Kenichi.

Similarly, the Lundquist reference fails to disclose plural springs. The claims call for plural "springs," and Lundquist shows only one spring 28. Therefore, even if the Lundquist reference is combined with Engelberger *et al.* and Kobayashi *et al.*, the terms of the claims are not satisfied. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn to the extent that it relies on the Japanese publication to Lundquist.


In addition, claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the movable member is disc shaped and is attached with multiple pins to a body of the mold member so that the movable part can be moved in an axial direction. None of the references, alone or in combination, show a disc shaped movable member that is attached with multiple pins and urged with plural springs as claimed. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-13 should be withdrawn.

Claims 14-18 are new. Claim 14 recites, among other things, positioning an inner part of a stack on a cylindrical part of the second mold member. Placing the inner part of the stack on a cylindrical part of the second mold member allows the stack to be easily positioned in the mold. In addition, claim 14 recites setting a side edge surface of a outer part of the stack in an outer recess of the bottom mold member. These steps are neither shown nor suggested by any of the references of record. Therefore, claims 14-18 are considered to be patentable over the references of record.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 01-0305.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Barlow
Reg. No. 32,377

Adduci, Mastriani & Schaumberg, L.L.P.
1200 Seventeenth St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036